



## Nye - Assessing the environmental and economic sustainability

**Faragò, Maria**

*Publication date:*  
2017

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Faragò, M. (Author). (2017). Nye - Assessing the environmental and economic sustainability. Sound/Visual production (digital)

---

### General rights


Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Nye - Assessing the environmental and economic sustainability

Maria Faragò, Research Assistant at DTU Environment  
 (mfar@env.dtu.dk)  
 September 12<sup>th</sup> 2017



# Master thesis project:

Eco-efficiency evaluation of a new urban water system with rainwater collection in Aarhus



- COWI  
Carstern Fjordback, udviklingschef, sektionsleder

**DTU Environment**  
Department of Environmental Engineering

- Silhorko-  
Eurowater
- HPNow ApS

- **Supervisors:**
  - Martin Rygaard, Associate Professor at DTU Environment
  - Sarah Brudler, PhD student at DTU Environment

- **Supervisors:**
  - Mariann Brun, Project manager at Aarhus Vand

aarhusvand



# Vision

New urban water system with rainwater collection

- 1 Flood protection
- 2 Rainwater use for toilet flushing and laundry




Area: 200 ha



● Nye

(source: Nye Lokal plan, 2016)

# Motivation




(source: DANVA, 2013)


- Aarhus average annual rainfall intensity:



**688 mm/year**




- Nye 1<sup>st</sup> phase: ca. 18 ha --> reduced area: ca. 9 ha
- Population: 2,000 inhabitants




- **Estimated runoff**: ca. 50,000 m<sup>3</sup>/y
- **Water demand** (toilet flushing & laundry): 31,000 m<sup>3</sup>/y

# Planning area: Nye, first phase



- Four main basins: Volume of 8600 m<sup>3</sup>
- Trenches/Channels: ca. 1 Km length

# Planning area: Nye, first phase



Two water supply networks:

1. **DW network** → potable water demand
2. **SW network** → non-potable water demand
3. **SW Treatment Plant** → capacity ca 6 m<sup>3</sup>/h


Source	Runoff [m <sup>3</sup> /year]	Contribution to the total runoff [%]
Roofs	38,000	76 %
Streets	3,710	8 %
Main roads	5,838	12 %
Other	1,820	4 %
Total	50,000	



# Aim of the master thesis project

## Sustainability Assessment

- ✓ Assess the sustainability of **options** for collecting and **re-using the rainwater** for **non-potable** use as an alternative to conventional **groundwater-based** drinking water in Nye, Aarhus
- ✓ Two dimensions of sustainability: Environmental and Economic




**Eco-efficiency**




# Methodology: Eco-efficiency

Phases:



Tools:




**Fig. 1.** Phases in eco-efficiency assessment according to ISO 14045 (ISO 14045, 2012).

# Methodology: LCA

ISO 14040: 2006

**Cradle to grave** approach → Inventory of materials' consumption and emissions along the life cycle



# Methodology: LCA


## Example of a life cycle **inventory analysis**

Secondary Water pipes				
Process: SW pipes	Amount	Unit	Assumptions/Calculations	Source
<b>Material:</b> HD-PE	1841	Kg	Estimated from total length, volume, and density	Aarhus Vand/ AV-Wavin
<b>Transportation</b> of pipes to construction site	46211	Kg.km	Distance 25.1 Km	See Appendix F-I
<b>Construction:</b> Excavation volume	1699	m <sup>3</sup>	Estimated	See Appendix F-I
<b>Construction:</b> Filling with soil from another construction site	448521	Kg	22 % of total excavated volume is filled with soil from another construction site.	See Appendix F-I
<b>Transportation</b> of soil from another construction site	2242604	Kg.km	Distance: 5 Km	See Appendix F-I
<b>Operation:</b> Distribution energy of the secondary water	127357	Kwh	Specific energy: app. 0.2 Kwh/m <sup>3</sup> , estimated through Haaland and Darcy-Weisbach equation.	See Appendix P
<b>Decommissioning:</b> Excavation volume	1699	m <sup>3</sup>	Assumption	See Appendix F-I
<b>Disposal:</b> HD-PE	1565	Kg	85 % recyclable	See Appendix F-I
<b>Life time</b> SW pipes	100	years	It is assumed that the system is dismantled after 25 years, and thus the recycling occur at the end of the 25 years even though the life time of the pipes can be up to 100 years	

# Methodology: LCA

## Inventory of inputs and outputs

Secondary Water pipes Process: SW pipes	Amount	Unit	Assumptions/Calculations	Source
Material: HD-PE	1841	Kg	Estimated from total length, volume, and density	Aarhus Vand/ AV-Wayin
Material: Transportation of pipes to construction site	46211	Kg.km	Distance 25.1 Km	See Appendix F-I
Construction: Excavation volume	1699	m3	Estimated	See Appendix F-I
Construction: Filling with soil from another construction site	448521	Kg	22 % of total excavated volume is filled with soil from another construction site.	See Appendix F-I
Transportation of soil from another construction site	2242604	Kg.km	Distance: 5 Km	See Appendix F-I
Operation: Distribution energy of the secondary water	127357	Kwh	Specific energy: app. 0.2 Kwh/m <sup>3</sup> , estimated through Haaland and Darcy-Weisbach equation.	See Appendix P
Decommissioning: Excavation volume	1699	m3	Assumption	See Appendix F-I
Disposal: HD-PE	1565	Kg	85 % recyclable	See Appendix F-I
Life time SW pipes	100	years	It is assumed that the system is dismantled after 25 years, and thus the recycling occur at the end of the 25 years even though the life time of the pipes can be up to 100 years	



## Impacts



Resources depletion

Eco-toxicity

Freshwater depletion



Freshwater eutrophication

Human Toxicity

Particulate matter

# Methodology: Life Cycle Costing

$$LCC = C_{IC} + C_C + C_{OM}$$

$C_{IC}$ : Initial Costs

$C_C$ : Construction and installation costs

$C_{OM}$ : Operational and Maintenance costs


Amortization Formula:

$$C = P \left( \frac{r(1+r)^n}{(1+r)^n - 1} \right)$$

P = initial investment


r = annual interest rate

n = life time or number of payments


$$\text{System value} = \frac{1}{LCC}$$

Lower costs – Higher System value

# Alternatives' definition




# Functional Unit and System boundaries

## Functional Unit:

"An urban water system aimed at *providing 31000 m<sup>3</sup>/year of water for non-potable applications, to 2000 inhabitants in Nye, while protecting from flooding*"


*Assessment time: 25 years*

## System boundaries:





# Results




- ✓ Total normalised impacts
- ✓ Life stages contribution
- ✓ Overall comparison
- ✓ Effect of runoff pollutants

- ✓ Total costs
- ✓ System value

- ✓ EEA quantification
- ✓ Overall interpretation



# 1. LCA: Total Normalised Impacts

- ✓ The performance of A0-GW is the worst → due to the relative increase in energy and detergents consumption at the end-user level
- ✓ Large percentage difference between A0 and the other alternatives in the Freshwater Withdrawal Impacts
- ✓ Only in the Eco-toxicity, A0 performs slightly better compared to CT1, CT2, and CT3 (2 % lower impacts)



Abbreviation	Impact category name
CC	Climate Change
ECOtot	Eco-toxicity (total)
RDfos	Resource Depletion (fossil)
RDres	Resource Depletion (reserve base)
FWI	Freshwater Withdrawal Impacts

# 1. LCA: Life stage's contribution/performance




## Life stages

- Material
- Construction
- Operation/Maintenance
- Decommissioning/Disposal
- ▨ Transportation


✓ Operation and Maintenance (OM) contributes to CC and RDfos

✓ Materials contribute to ECOtot and RDres



Dominance of materials coming from the stormwater collection system

# 1. LCA: Overall comparison of the alternatives with rainwater use



- ✓ The electricity in OM was found to be the most impacting parameter in Climate Change and Resource Depletion (Fossil)
- ✓ The infrastructures (s. steel components) were found to be the most impacting in Eco-toxicity and Resource Depletion (reserve base) expect for DT-RWH
- ✓ The chemicals' consumption showed significant impacts in CT1 and CT2 in particular in the Resource Depletion (reserve base)

## Alternatives


CT1 UF-UV  
CT2 UF-H2O2  
CT3 RO-UV  
DT-RWH

- 1 CT1 and CT2 seem the most sustainable according to *Climate Change* and *Fossil* Resource Depletion ↓ Energy consumption
- 2 DT seem the most sustainable according to *Eco-toxicity* and *Reserve base* Resource Depletion ↓ Chemicals consumption and s. steel amount

# 1. LCA: Inclusion of the effect of runoff pollutants

- ✓ Increased Impacts in Ecotoxicity, freshwater, and marine eutrophication
- ✓ DT shows the best performance → filter rejection sent to WWTP discharging in Aarhus Bay


Pollutants
TSS
Lead
Cadmium
Chromium
Copper
Zinc
Nickel
Mercury
16PAH
Nitrogen
Phosphorus
COD
BOD
Iron
Aluminium



## 2. LCC: Total annual costs and system value


- ✓ A0 is more costly than the alternatives with rainwater use (around 30 %)
- ✓ Investment costs are the highest if we exclude water taxes
- ✓ Compared to A0, the alternatives with rainwater use show higher system value (lower costs)
- ✓ DT-RWH shows the lowest costs and the highest system value (3 – 14 % higher system value)

$$\text{System value} = \frac{1}{\text{LCC}}$$




# 3. Eco-efficiency assessment

$$EEA = \frac{\text{System value}}{\text{Environmental Indicators}}$$



- ✓ DT-RWH the most eco-innovative according to all the impact categories
- ✓ CT1 and CT2 also eco-innovative according to climate change and fossil resource depletion





# Limitations and future perspectives

## Limitations in the LCA assessment:

1. Effect of the temperature of the rainwater during winter → not included
2. Water balance based on estimates provided by Aarhus Vand
3. Rainwater quality estimates missing: derived from literature

## Limitations in the Economic assessment:

1. Secondary water price not yet estimated by Aarhus Vand
2. Missing costs were found through online search and literature
3. Costs of avoiding flooding and non-monetized costs not included
4. Total value added of each actor involved instead of system value calculated through LCC

# Conclusion

With respect to the LCA assessment:

1. The alternatives with rainwater use are **more sustainable** than the BAU scenario → Lower **Freshwater withdrawal impacts** and lower energy and laundry detergents consumption at the households' level
2. The most influential life stages: **Operation and Maintenance** (electricity and chemicals) and **materials' generation** (basins, trenches, tank materials)
3. The treatment of rainwater with ultrafiltration (**CT1** and **CT2**) was found to be the most sustainable according to climate change and fossil resource depletion.
4. The private rainwater harvesting systems (**DT-RWH**) the most sustainable according to Eco-toxicity and Resource depletion reserve base
5. The inclusion of the **runoff pollutants** increased the relevance primarily of the **Eco-toxicity** and secondarily of **freshwater** and **marine eutrophication**

# Conclusion

With respect to the Economic assessment:

1. The alternatives with rainwater use are **less costly** (around 30 %) than A0
2. The performance of the alternative with rainwater use are almost the same and the system value does not differ significantly between the alternatives
3. The decentralised private rainwater harvesting (**DT-RWH**) has slightly **higher system value** (2-14 %) compared to the centralised alternatives

# Conclusion

With respect to the Eco-efficiency assessment:

1. **LCA impacts** were found to be the deciding factor in the selection of the most eco-efficient alternative
2. The **DT-RWH** is found to be the most eco-innovative according to all the impact categories
3. The alternatives CT1 and CT2 are “eco-innovative” according to Climate change and Fossil resource depletion
4. The urban water system in Nye can be considered a role model for sustainable and **self-sufficient cities**.



Thank you for your attention!



An aerial photograph of a suburban neighborhood. The houses are mostly two-story, with light-colored roofs and walls. They are interspersed with green trees and lawns. A winding river or stream flows through the lower part of the image. In the background, there are more houses and a larger body of water. The overall scene is peaceful and well-maintained.

Questions?